

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 are pending in the present application. By this amendment, claims 1, 9-10, 12, 17 and 20 are amended, and claims 2-3, 13-14 and 18-19 are canceled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present claims in view of the following remarks.

I. Prior Art Rejections

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 12-13 and 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,577,189 to Gay et al. (hereinafter "Gay"). As noted above, claims 2 and 13 have been canceled without prejudice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended, claim 1 recites that a method of resizing a graphical user interface of a computer software application, the graphical user interface having at least one graphical user interface element disposed thereon, comprises repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the graphical user interface element includes moving the graphical user interface element from a first position to a second position, wherein the second position is the same relative position on the graphical user interface after the graphical user interface has been resized, as the first position of the graphical user interface element prior to altering the size of the graphical user interface to the selected size. Similarly, as amended, claim 12 recites that a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer resize a graphical user interface of a computer software application, the graphical user interface having at least one graphical user interface element disposed thereon performs the step of repositioning the graphical user interface element according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the graphical user interface element includes moving the graphical user interface element from a first position to a second position, wherein the second position is the same relative position on the graphical user interface after the graphical user interface has been resized, as the first

position of the graphical user interface element prior to altering the size of the graphical user interface to the selected size.

Gay does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a graphical user interface of a computer software application or a computer readable medium having stored thereon computer-executable instructions which when executed by a computer resize a graphical user interface of a computer software application as recited by claims 1 and 12 of the present invention. In contrast, Gay teaches a method of establishing spatial relationships between two graphical elements displayed on a page by creating a distribution frame defining an area in which graphical elements are to be placed, selecting whether the frame should be resized to fit the graphical elements within the frame or whether the graphical elements within the frame should be resized to fit the frame, and selecting the spacing to be maintained between the graphical elements. If the option is selected to resize the graphical elements to fit the frame, then as the frame is adjusted, the graphical elements are resized to fill the distribution frame while maintaining the designated spacing between the elements. This is not analogous to the method or the computer readable medium recited by the present invention because Gay fails to teach or suggest that the graphical elements within the distribution frame are moved from a first position to a second position that is the same relative position on the distribution frame after the distribution frame has been adjusted as the first position of the graphical element prior to adjusting the distribution frame to a selected size. Instead, Gay teaches that the graphical elements are resized to fill the distribution frame, without suggesting that the graphical elements are moved from a first position on the distribution frame to a second position on the distribution frame such that the second position is the same relative position on the distribution frame as the first position.

For at least these reasons, claims 1 and 12 are allowable over Gay. Since claims 4-6 and 15-16 depend respectively from claims 1 and 12 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that Gay does not anticipate Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claims 4-6 and 15-16 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Gay in View of Argiolas

Claims 3 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay in view of United States Patent No. 5,815,151 to Argiolas (hereinafter “Argiolas”). As discussed above, claims 3 and 14 have been canceled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Gay in View of Owings

Claims 7-9, 11, 17-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay in view of United States Patent No. 6,335,743 to Owings (hereinafter “Owings”). As noted above, claim 18 has been canceled without prejudice. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A description of amended claim 1 can be relied upon above. For at least the reasons given above, claim 1 is allowable over Gay. Since claims 7-8 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Gay and Owings cannot make obvious Applicants’ claimed invention as embodied in claims 7-8 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 9 recites that a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon, comprises repositioning the plurality of controls according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the plurality of controls includes moving the plurality of controls from a first position to a second position, wherein the second position is the same relative position on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as the first position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size.

Gay does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 9 of the present invention. Instead, Gay teaches a method of establishing spatial relationships between two graphical elements displayed on a page by creating a distribution frame defining an area in which graphical elements are to be placed, selecting whether the frame should be resized to fit the graphical elements within the frame or whether the graphical elements within the frame should be resized to fit the frame, and selecting the spacing to be maintained between the

graphical elements. If the option is selected to resize the graphical elements to fit the frame, then as the frame is adjusted, the graphical elements are resized to fill the distribution frame while maintaining the designated spacing between the elements. This is not analogous to the method of claim 9 because Gay fails to teach or suggest that the graphical elements are moved from a first position on the distribution frame to a second position on the distribution frame, which is the same relative position on the distribution frame after the distribution frame has been adjusted as the first position of the graphical element prior to adjusting the distribution frame to a selected size. To the contrary, Gay teaches that the graphical elements are resized, not moved from a first to a second position that is the same relative position on the distribution frame as the first position, when the distribution frame is adjusted.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Owings to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies in the teaching of Gay. However, like Gay, Owings does not teach or suggest a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application comprising repositioning the plurality of controls according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the plurality of controls includes moving the plurality of controls from a first position to a second position, wherein the second position is the same relative position on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as the first position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size. To the contrary, Owings teaches a method for providing a window capable of being resized including determining if the window has been resized, and if the window has been resized, then moving the controls if necessary, without suggesting that the controls are moved from a first position to a second position that is the same relative position on the window after the window has been resized as the first position of the controls prior to altering the size of the window to the selected size.

Since both the teaching of Gay and the teaching of Owings fail to teach or suggest a method of resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 9, the combined teaching of Gay and Owings cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention embodied in independent claim 9. Further, since claim 11 depends from claim 9 and recites additional claim features, the combined teaching of Gay and Owings cannot make obvious claim 11. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is

respectfully requested.

As amended, claim 17 recites that a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application, the dialog window having a plurality of controls disposed thereon, comprises an autolayout module operative to reposition the plurality of controls according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the plurality of controls includes moving the plurality of controls from a first position to a second position, wherein the second position is the same relative position on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as the first position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size.

Gay does not teach or suggest a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 17 of the present invention. In contrast, Gay teaches a system for establishing spatial relationships between two graphical elements displayed on a page including a graphical applications program operative to automatically resize the graphical elements within a distribution frame to fill the distribution frame when the frame is adjusted. This is not analogous to the system of claim 17 because Gay fails to teach or suggest that the graphical applications program is operative to reposition the graphical elements according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the graphical elements includes moving the graphical elements from a first position to a second position that is the same relative position on the distribution frame after the distribution frame has been adjusted as the first position of the graphical elements prior to altering the size of the distribution frame to the selected size. Instead of the graphical applications program moving the graphical elements from a first position to a second position that is the same relative position on the distribution frame as the first position when the distribution frame is adjusted, Gay teaches that the graphical applications program resizes the graphical elements to fill the adjusted distribution frame.

The Office Action relies on the teaching of Owings to allegedly cure the above-noted deficiencies in the teaching of Gay. However, like Gay, Owings does not teach or suggest a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application comprising an autolayout module operative to reposition the plurality of controls according to the set of rules, wherein repositioning the plurality of controls includes moving the plurality of controls from a first position to a second position, wherein the

second position is the same relative position on the dialog window after the dialog window has been resized, as the first position of the plurality of controls prior to altering the size of the dialog window to the selected size. To the contrary, Owings teaches a system for providing a window capable of being resized including a resize layout manager operative to move controls within a window, if necessary, when the window is resized, without suggesting that the controls are moved from a first position to a second position that is the same relative position on the window after the window has been resized as the first position of the controls prior to altering the size of the window to the selected size.

Since both the teaching of Gay and the teaching of Owings fail to teach or suggest a system for resizing a dialog window of a computer software application as recited by claim 17, the combined teaching of Gay and Owings cannot make obvious Applicants' claimed invention embodied in independent claim 17. Further, since claim 20 depends from claim 17 and recites additional claim features, the combined teaching of Gay and Owings cannot make obvious claim 20. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Gay in View of Owings and Further in View of Thomson

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay in view of Owings and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,682,487 to Thomson (hereinafter "Thomson"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

A description of amended independent claim 9 can be relied upon above. For at least the reasons given above, claim 9 is allowable over the combined teaching of Gay and Owing. Since claim 10 depends from claim 9 and recites additional features, Applicants respectfully submit that the combined teaching of Gay and Owings does not make obvious Applicants' claimed invention as embodied in claim 10 for at least these reasons. Accordingly, withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Over Gay in View of Owings and Further in View of Argiolas

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gay in view of Owings and further in view of Argiolas. As discussed above, claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice.

CONCLUSION

For at least these reasons, Applicants assert that the pending claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 are in condition for allowance. The Applicants further assert that this response addresses each and every point of the Office Action, and respectfully requests that the Examiner pass this application with claims 1, 4-12, 15-17 and 20 to allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at 404.954.5042.



Merchant & Gould
3200 IDS Center
80 South 80th Street
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402-2215
Telephone: 404.954.5100

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD, LLC

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Jodi L. Hartman". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large loop at the end.

Jodi L. Hartman
Reg. No. 55,251